

THE
Further Vindication, &c.

OF
Mr. Owen

Consider'd in a LETTER to a Friend.

S I R,

IN Obedience to your Commands, I send you here a short Account of my Thoughts concerning Mr. O's *Further Vindication, &c.* In the way of Writing he has taken up, he is not (I believe) to be parallel'd, having out-done all Men living a Bar and half, except haply two or three of the United Brethren, who have sufficiently expos'd Mr. Baxter and Father *Allop*. I shall not so much as endeavour to requite him, being oblig'd to the contrary, and having already engag'd my self there-
 to by Promise, which I will religiously observe. For which Reason you must not expect here a particular Answer, or that I should follow him step by step: *My* Work then as well as *Yours* would be endless, and it would be difficult for me not to retort some of his ill Language, and discover many of his Misrepresentations or Mistakes, which he is not capable of enduring, nor you willing to be troubl'd with. All my Design, and I suppose your expectation is,

Prov. 26. 4.
 R. R.

that the whole Argument be laid plain and open unto the view of any one of common Sense. This I propose to myself to do in the Order of the Sermon, and as briefly as I can.

And first you must remember, that Mr. De Lanne severely tax'd the Church of *England* as guilty of diminishing from the Word of God, by leaving out the *Titles* of the Psalms in our Liturgy Translation; and that I undertook the defence of this Omission, first from the uncertainty of the *Titles* being Canonical. Now I submit it to your Judgment or any observant Reader's weighing the Arguments on both sides, as they are to be found in *Rem.* and in *R's* on *R's*, whether Mr. O. (who is Mr. D's Vindicator) has given a convincing Proof of the *Certainty* of the *Titles* being Canonical: I say, this is submitted to your Judgment without more ado. This notwithstanding I shall here have occasion to repeat some things, and observe others *de novo*, which will minister some further satisfaction in this controverted Point.

Vind. p.

44

R.R. p. 15.

Mr. O. has not stuck to pronounce me a *Blasphemer*, and to give me words of *Brass*, because I affirm'd, *many of the Titles were to no purpose at all*; nay, he will not allow that my suppos'd Ignorance can make any Attonement for me, tho' *God himself winked at the times of Ignorance*. But let us look back unto the Rector's obvious meaning. Mr. D. contended that the *Titles* unfolded the Mysteries of the Psalms; the Rector deny'd that they serve to any such purpose at all. *Ex. gr. A Psalm, a Song, &c.* These *Titles* unlock no Mysteries that I know of, and if they must needs be call'd Keys they want Wards. Other *Titles* are infinitely more Myste-rious than the Psalms themselves. It cannot be thought the Holy Ghost meant to give us them as Keys to open the secret Sense of the Psalms; that would be to explain *obscurum per obscurum*, which I am perswaded the Spirit of God would never have done. When Jesus Christ expounded his Parables, he made 'em clear as the Sun. Besides, whereas the Mysteries of the Gospel are confirm'd out of an abundance of Passages in the Psalms, I do not find one *Title* brought to prove any one Mystery, tho' indeed some Fathers (who delighted, *Ludens campo Scriptu-*

rarum)

29
32

varum, as *Jerom* speaks) took a liberty to find out I know not what Mysteries in the *Titles*.

But to return, I pleaded formerly that the *Chaldee Paraphrase*, the *Syriack*, *Arabick*, and the *LXX* Version generally us'd by the Hellenistical Jews, and the Christians for several Ages differ much from the *Hebrew*; that *Gregory Nyssen* observ'd there was not an intire Agreement between the Christians and the Jews about the *Titles*, especially of *Psal.* 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, &c. That this Father asserts not the Divine Authority of the *Titles* but Ecclesiastical Custom. By the way note, that Mr. O. has declin'd giving any sort of Answer to this Testimony of *Nyssen*. I add, *Gregorius* believ'd *Moses* was not the Pen-man of the *90th. Psal.* *Eben* R.R. p. 13.
Exra affirms the *61st. Psal.* was compos'd (not by *David*, as the *Title* has it, but) in the Captivity by some other Person. Doth it not follow hence, that according to the judgment of these Churches, and these Authors, the *Titles* are not Canonical, at least not certainly so? And are *they* to be all damn'd for so many Blasphemers? It might have suffic'd Mr. O. to have let alone the charge of *Blasphemy* (which I fancy is a little too much) and to have contented himself with ranking me among Dunces, tho' at the same time you see I have some not contemptible Company. Synop. Crit.

I do not know any better way to clear this Matter than by considering the *Titles* of the several Books of Scripture, some whereof are most certainly not Canonical, not one of a certainty such, and some doubtful. The first Section of *Moses's* Pentateuch is in Hebrew call'd *Beresith*, but in the *LXX*, *Genesis*, and in our English Translation, *The first Book of Moses call'd Genesis*: Are we, Dissenters and all, yea and all Christendom Blasphemers for departing from the *Hebrew*? The truth is, I do not believe the Author of the Pentateuch divided his Work into Five Sections or Books; but the Church of the Jews, who for convenience intituled each Section from the first word of it, tho' the *LXX* more judiciously from the principal design and matter contain'd in those Sections. I prefer the *Title* of the *LXX* to that of the *Heb.* in the Historical part of the Kings. In *Heb.* we find *the First and Second Book of Samuel*, in the *LXX* more properly and truly call'd *the First and Second Book of Kings*.

Samuel died, *1. Sam. 25.* The rest of this and the next Book was not (neither could be) written by *Samuel*, nor concerning him, but the Kings of *Israel* (and *Samuel* himself is I conceive comprehended in *Kings*) being the Supreme Judge,) The *Heb.* divides the *Psalter* into Five Sections. Are we, and the Dissenters all *Blasphemers* for leaving this Division out of our Translation? If it be answer'd, that some *Heb.* Copies have not these Five Sections or Books of the *Psalter* (which I know not, nor will trouble my self to examin) I ask which are the true and uncorrupted Copies? (for both cannot be) and why do we follow the latter Copies rather than those which are ~~more~~ in all Men's hands? The Books of the Prophets are thus; intitul'd, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiab*, &c. and the Apostles Epistles thus, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, &c. I cannot think the inspir'd Prophets and Apostles set these *Titles* on the head of their Books or Letters. For they prefix their Names themselves at the beginning and as part of the Body of those Books and Letters, but the *Titles* on the top were added for conveniency. There needed no Inspiration to do this. The general Title of ~~these~~ Books of the New Testament is *H. xxiij. gradian*, &c. but is not Canonical, say *Grotius* and *Hammond* (and yet they Comment upon it) being added by the Church, when the Inspir'd Books were put together. That Title, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*, is found in all MSS. Copies (says *Beza*) except one only, which I hope will break no squares. Now *Grotius* is of Opinion *Luke* wrote this Epistle, others *Barnabas*; some *Clemens Romanus*, Dr. *Hammond* that the Author is uncertain, this being the very Reason many Churches receiv'd not this Epistle into the Canon of a good while. I must not pass the particular Reason which the *Latin* Churches gave for their rejecting this Epistle to the *Heb. sc.* because *some things were in it favouring the Novatian Heresie*, as they then judg'd. Mr. *Pool* imputes this to their Ignorance, but challenges them not with *Blasphemy*: nor did I ever hear that *Grotius*, *Hammond*, and the rest who deny *Paul* to be the Author of this Epistle, were ever censur'd as *Blasphemers*.

St. *John* doubtless was the Author of those three Epistles that go under his Name, but not of the *Titles* also. This
Apostle

[5]

Apostle and Evangelist for some special Reasons conceal'd his Name, when he wrote contrary to the practice of the rest. Nor can I believe any other inspir'd Person affixt those *Titles*, it being highly improbable, that *John* by the Spirit should conceal himself, and another by the same Spirit should discover him. I hope Mr. O. will not call me *Blasphemer* for this. The meaning of all is, the Church of God did ever take the Liberty of giving *Titles* unto Books sometimes by Conjecture, and sometimes of certain knowledge, as we at this day prefix the Contents before Chapters, and call the Books of Psalms in Metre, *The Psalms of David*, which is not the *Hebrew Title*, Or else the Copiers of them did it for obvious Reasons, viz. that holy Men might more readily upon occasion go to such Books, and consult them, as they lay in their Closets or Libraries among other Volumes of the Scripture. Briefly the *Titles* of the Psalms and of the several Books of Scripture must (as I conceive) run the same fate, all must be of a certainty Canonical or none at all can be.

Mr. O. has himself confess'd enough to overthrow the whole Fabrick of his elaborate Discourse on this Subject. He acknowledg'd, *It was a prevailing Opinion, that all the Psalms were Penn'd by David, that August. Chrysost. and Bede, and several Jewish Doctors thought so.* What then will become of the *Title* of the 90th. and of many other Psalms? Were they of a certainty of their Penning, unto whom they are ascrib'd in the *Hebrew Text*? Or is the Rector *singular* in a doubtful Point, when he has so many giving in their Testimony on his side? Tho' by the way I see no great harm in being *singular*, when the Point is doubtful, but much more I apprehend not that there is any *Blasphemy* in such *Singularity*. Besides I pray Sir take notice, how Mr. O. expresseth himself concerning the *Title* of the 137. Psal. *It is not material to us, who compos'd it, we are satisfied it was divinely inspir'd.* But is it not as material that one Psalm should have a *Title* to unfold its Mysteries as another? And why will not he give me leave to declare my self thus? *It is not material to me what becomes of the Titles, I am satisfy'd the Psalms themselves were divinely Inspir'd. I make no reckoning of those Critical Disputes about the 90th. Psal. whether*

Vind. p. 47.

Moses,

Moses, or David, or any other Inspir'd Person penn'd that Psalm, I am content to believe it Canonical. Great then is the power of Truth you see: It will out sometimes even before a Man is aware.

But after all this, I will now suppose (what I believe you will not grant) that Mr. O. has clear'd his Point beyond contradiction, yet still I must condemn Mr. D. (and his Vindicator too) for reflecting on us, because we leave out an essential part of the *Psalms* in our Liturgy Translation.

Ser. p. 4. R. I argu'd formerly, *The Dissenters translate 'em not all*; "some
R. p. 15. "part of 'em Translated is thrust out of the Text into the
"Margin, like a various Reading, or mere conjecture, or
"as not material; but to this he offers nothing. I added,
They leave 'em out of the Metrical Psalms, neither do they sing 'em. But he endeavours to take off this Retort thus, *The
V. p. 53. Titles were not design'd to be sung.* Good! 'Tis my very Plea
in Defence of the Church of England, our Liturgy Translation was design'd for singing, but the *Titles* were not.
No, says Mr. O. *You read that Translation.* I answer, 1. Some negligent Ministers do indeed read 'em; 'tis their Fault,
2. Some conforming Nonconformists will read 'em; 'tis their Crime,
3. Some cannot prevail with their People to bear a part in the rehearsing 'em; 'tis their Unhappiness.
But still this Translation is design'd not for Reading and Instruction in the Publick Worship, but Devotion. For the Order of the Church is that the *Psalms* in this Translation should be *said or sung*; said? that is at least repeated *alternatim*, by Minister and People, which is a species of singing, as we believe. Observe then, they are sung in all Cathedrals, they are repeated in multitudes of Parochial Churches, and Noblemens Chappels. What would the Man have more? Shall the Infelicity of some Ministers, the Treachery of others, or the Carelessness of another sort be thought sufficient to force the Church to take new measures, and lay aside her Liturgy Translation? I trow not. Besides you should observe further, that if the *Titles* be Canonical, they ought at least to have been Printed with the Metrical *Psalms*, tho' not sung: So the Jews did. Briefly here's nothing but Cavil, not a shadow of Answer. But Mr. O. concludes, *Their* (the Dissenters) *not reading the
Titles*

Titles (in the Congregation and out of the other Translation) is an *Innocent Omission*. Hem! an Innocent Omission? Verily I cannot get this down. If the *Titles* be an Essential part of the *Psalms*, and useful to unfold the Mysteries in them, as Mr. O. & Mr. D. will have it, can there be a more Sacrilegious Omission than first not to Translate the *Titles* exactly, and then neglect the Reading them? Not to make use of the Canonical Key, but to burst violently and blindly into the Chambers of Divine Secrets, like Thieves and Robbers? Besides a little Justice would have taught Mr. O. that our *not Printing* the *Titles* is as innocent an Omission, as their *not Reading* 'em. One might reasonably expect just Weights and Measures. Either let the whole body of Christians throughout the World come under the Charge of being Corrupters of the *Psalms*, or let the Church of *England* and the Rector pass in the Croud as Innocent also. Why should we be made an Example, when even our Accusers themselves are guilty of the same Omission? I leave you then to judge how well Mr. O. has acquitted himself on this first Question.

The next is about the Verses interpolated *Psal. 14*. I remit you to what I have in Sermon and *R. R.* offer'd on this Argument, and to inform your self thence whether Mr. D. did honestly impute it unto *us*, that *we* foisted them in, and whether Mr. O. has thoroughly justify'd him. But I'll in a few words consider Mr. O.'s Vindication of *Jerom*, whom he would fain lick clean, if it were possible. He informs us, who they are that have commended him, and it's confess he was a great Man, but perhaps his truest Character is, *Magna virtutes, nec minora* ———. In the Point about Bishops it has been often enough laid to his charge, that he says and unsays, and contradicts himself. In the Letters which he exchange'd with *St. Austin*, he maintain'd the lawfulness of Dissimulation, and endeavour'd to excuse *Peter* and *Barnabas*. He is believed to have been disgusted for not being made a Bishop, and on that score depressed the Order as low as he could with any colour of Truth. Nor did he escape the suspicion of ———. Besides, he was so bent against the *LXX.* that he blusht not to abuse 'em, chusing to represent 'em by some corrupt Copies, rather than

than by the known and unquestionable reading. I will give you two Instances. *Zach. 12. 10.* cited by *St. John 19. 37.* They shall look on him whom they pierced, *Jerom's LXX* it seems read not *Exultans*, but *exultans* also, even as our *LXX* doth at this day. But *Jerom* might (if he would have been ingenuous) have taken notice of what he could not be ignorant, that the right reading in the *LXX* was *Exultans*, as is witnessed by four Fathers more early than himself. *Justin M.* in his Dialogue against *Trypho* the Jew. *Tertul-*

lian likewise frequently. *St. Cyprian* in his 20 Testimony against those People. To whom add *Lactantius* also, *Zach. 13. 4.* He makes the *LXX* speak perfect Nonsense, *non sum Prophetes ego, quia Homo genuit me a juventute mea.* Whereas even in our present *LXX* we read thus agreeably with the *Heb.* *in qui uenerunt ego, non respondens ipsi uideri, sed ego qui, in respondens ei uideri me, in uenerunt me.* Finally I observ'd in *R. R.* how scandalously he abus'd *St. Luke*. No, replies *Mr. O.* For as *Paul* is call'd a *Babler* by the *Athenians*, so was *Luke* accounted by the Nations an *obscure vile Person* and of *no great credit*, not by *Jerom*, tho' *Jerom* relates it, as *Luke* did that of *Paul*. But there are many differences between the one and the other. *Luke* was an *Inspir'd Historian*, flourish'd when what he relates of *Paul* happen'd, it may be had his Relation from the Apostle himself, and had no Cause to support: But *Jerom* liv'd about 350 Years after *Luke*, Writes what he backs with no Authority or probable proof, and was now calling into question the truth of *Luke's* History. There is then all the Reason in the World to believe that this Character of *Luke*, tho' father'd on the Gentiles, was the Issue of *Jerom's* own Brain, to disparage the *LXX* and to set up the *Heb. Bible*. Nor did *St. Luke* write the *Acts* for the use of the Gentiles, as *Mr. O.* asserts, tho' in time ('tis true) it might fall into their hands. But the Historian addresses it to *Theophilus* a Christian, Chap. 1. 1. And what if *Jerom's* Gentiles were the Gentile Believers? Did they esteem *Luke* obscure, vile and of little Reputation? Sure (if this was his meaning) *Jerom* was not a little mistaken, to speak as softly as I can. Besides can any one believe *Luke* was less considerable among the unbelieving Nations, than the other *Inspir'd Writers*?

He

He was the most learned of 'em all, except perhaps *Paul*. His Greek (as Criticks say) is the purest of all. He was a known Physician, which doubtless commended him to the esteem of the Nations, both Jews and Gentiles as he travell'd along with *Paul*, and that *before his Writings were ever published*. So that *Jerom* cannot be shelter'd by pretending, not he; but the Nations accounted him *obscure*, &c. For this Father further affirms, *Non debuit, &c. St. Luke ought not to write any thing contrary to the Scriptures, that were then in the hands of the Nations*; that is contrary to the corrupt *LXX*. Here you see, he magisterially declares what the Spirit of God ought not to do. Belike for fear of disobliging them, who as yet had not the *Hebrew* verity among them. Right *Jerom* all over. The Inspir'd Evangelist *Luke* to serve a small turn must tell a Lye: Or lest he should offend the Nations, must dissemble the Truth, *The Hebrew* verity, and this without all regard to the Jews, and Jewish Converts, whom he must needs scandalize thereby. Here is Dissimulation with a witness, and made a necessary Duty (*non debuit*) in an Inspir'd Pen-man of Scripture. Whoever is dispos'd to vindicate *Jerom*, may go to his Letters written to *St. Augustin*, and furnish himself with Arguments enow to that purpose. But shall a Man lye for God? Surely *Jerom's* much Oriental Learning made him mad, I will not say a *Blasphemer*. In fine, that *Jerom* fram'd this Character for *Luke* in the name of the Nations will appear from what he adds. Hoc generaliter observandum, quod ubicunque SS. Apostoli & Apostolici viri loquuntur. ad populos, iis plerumque Testimoniis abutuntur, quæ jam fuerant in Gentibus divulgata. *The Holy Apostles and Apostolick Men* (neglecting the *Hebrew* verity) *when they speak to the People, make use of those Testimonies*, (viz. which *Jerom* contended were mistaken and false) *out of the LXX. which had already been divulg'd among the Nations* ~~that~~ Is not this *superfine* Doctrine? One needs not be *Hypercritical* to observe hence, that *Jerom* makes the Apostles and their Companions in Preaching the Gospel to be a Pack of Dissemblers, and guilty of the same pious Frauds and holy Cheats, that he before suggested particularly of *Luke*. Once more

Commenting on *Mic. 5. 2*. He thus delivers himself, Sunt autem qui allerunt, &c. There are who affirm (I believe no body but himself) that almost in all the Testimonies which are brought out of the Old Testament this Error is committed, either that the Order is chang'd, or the Words, and sometimes the very sense is different, the Apostles or Evangelists not gathering their Testimonies out of the Book, but trusting to their Memories, which sometimes fail'd them. Sir, Can you read these Lines without Horror and Amusement? The Spirit of God surely (whereby they wrote) forgot not himself, tho' they did. That which follows from the whole is, that *Jerom* is not defended. The *LXX.* as to that Passage in the *Acts* Chap. 7. was in *Jerom's* days more correct, than the *Hebrew* verity now is, and that the *LXX.* was follow'd by the Inspir'd Infallible Apostles, and Apostolical Men, as *Jerom* acknowledgeth. May it not then be infer'd hence as probable, that *Paul* follow'd them in his 3d. to the *Romans* v. 13. &c. and transcrib'd the Verses out of the then *LXX*? O! but the Greek Fathers do not Comment on these Verses. Supposing this (for I have 'em not ready at hand, nor leisure to examin them all) the Reason may be, either they Commented on them in other places, or it was an innocent Omission, or else 'tis but a negative Argument and unconcluding. But after all, let us imagine the Three Verses have been interpolated, this is no just Excuse of Mr. D. who accus'd us for soisting them in. Why may not we do so as well as, and after *Paul*? And besides they are in the Latin Vulgar Version, which was in use in *Jerom's* days, and is still in good Credit with Mr. O. You may see more Reasons given to excuse the Church of *England*. *Serin.* p. 7. R. R. p. 18. which I will not trouble you with. Here I leave this part of the Controversie to the Judgment of any Man of Understanding, whether Mr. O. has vindicated either *Jerom* or Mr. D.

The Question about the Three Verses *Psal. 14.* occasion'd a more general one concerning the *LXX.* and the *Hebrew* Copies of the Old Testament: The former are by my Adversaries said to have been corrupted; and I grant
red

[11]
ted it, but withal affirm'd that so are the *Hebrew* also. But Mr. O. undertakes to prove they were not corrupted before and in our Saviour's days.

Here I must premise (because Mr. O. makes such an hideous Out-cry against the Rector, as if he were about depriving the Church of the Scriptures, and a Divine Knowledge of the reveal'd Will of God) that my Argument is not intended, neither looks that way at all, as any fair Adversary would grant. The Truths of Revelation are to be sought for, not out of the *Hebrew Text only*, nor out of the *LXX. only*, but out of both, which lend their helping hand to one another, together with all other Ancient Translations, and those numerous Quotations of Scripture which we meet with in the Fathers. And I humbly conceive nothing ministers more advantage unto Atheists, than obstinately to contend that the *Hebrew Text* is not in the least corrupted, and to strip us of all other means of correcting it. Now Mr. O. attempts to evince his Opinion by Three Arguments.

I. That the *Hebrew Bibles* are *de facto* incorrupt.

II. That the Jews could not.

III. Would not corrupt them. The first he confirms thus, *Because Christ never charg'd the Jews with corrupting them.* A. If the *Hebrew Text* was the same in Christ's as in our days (which Mr. O. must acknowledge) then it had been corrupted in Christ's time: This appears afterwards. Besides I retort his Reason thus, the *LXX.* was not corrupted in the Apostles days, because they never charg'd that Version with any Corruptions, as they would and ought to have done. As Christ bids his Disciples to *search the Scriptures* (the *Hebrew Copy*) So St. Paul commends the Bereans that they *searched the Scriptures*, and Timothy, that by his Mother and Grandmother he had been train'd up in the Knowledge of the Scriptures, viz. in the *LXX.* for all these were either Gentiles, or Gentile Proselytes, or Hellenistical Jews, and therefore us'd the *LXX.* When Origen and Jerom speak thus, *That most of the allegations made by Christ and his Apostles out of the Old Testament are still* there,

Synop. in
Ex. 1

there, they plainly enough confess that *some* are not, and consequently there must have been a corruption of the Old Scriptures according to these Fathers. On the other hand I'll give you a better Argument in proof of their Corruption, *viz.* because they had been corrupted before *Esra's* time, *who* (say most of the Fathers) *corrected the Errors that had crept in afore-time, and amended them, as the Hebrews report.* Now tell me, is it not much more probable, that they were somewhat corrupted between *Esra* and Christ? Had God a greater care of the Scriptures under the second Temple, than under the first, when Prophets were common among them? But of this more by and by.

2. Mr. O. in his Harangue here insinuates that I affirm *an Universal Corruption of the Hebrew Copies*, but 'tis Mr. O's own fancy not mine; and besides he talks very highly of Providence, even as if there lay an absolute engagement on God, either not to suffer any Corruption, or miraculously to discover it. *A* Why then has Providence permitted so many various Readings in the New Testament? and why has not God by some extraordinary means told us, whether the latter Period *1 Jo. 2. 23.* was written by Divine Inspiration, or added by some Transcriber? The summ is, Providence has taken care that all the material necessary and Essential Doctrines of Religion are still abundantly preserved in the Scriptures, and no false Doctrines therein establish'd, which I take to be true both of the *Hebrew*, the *LXX*, and the New Testament. But still in all Ages before Printing, Corruptions of other kinds crept in, and God for Reasons best known to his Wisdom has permitted it.

3. It must be granted a pious Jew would not purposely Corrupt the *Hebrew Text*, but others would. That very Talmudical Tale, that one *Solomon* endeavour'd to root *God* out of the Text shews that some Jews would have Corrupted the *Hebrew Text*. You see how unconcluding Mr. O's Arguments are. In a word, that the Jews would have corrupted the Word of God in the Prophecies pointing at Jesus Christ, is undeniably true from *Iustin Martyr* his Dialogue, wherein he chargeth them with it. It must be allow'd
thence.

thence that they had inclination enough to attempt it, or else the Martyr could in no wise be excused; whether they were successful is to be examin'd in the next place, and

1. From the Testimony of *Justin* and in answer to Mr. O. I affirm,

1. That *Justin Martyr* did understand both the *Hebrew* and *Syriac* Languages, and so doubtless was acquainted with the *Hebrew* Bible. For in *Apology 2d.* He calls himself *the Son of Priscus Bacchius born or come from Flavia Neapolis in the Syrian Palestine.* Accordingly I find him playing the Critic upon the Etymology of *Satanas*, *Dialog. p. 331.* deriving it from the Jewish and Syrian Tongue; *Sata*, signifying *Apostata, & Nas, Serpens.* Yea, Mr. O's instance proves him skill'd in the *Hebrew*; nor was he mistaken when he affirm'd, that *Israel* imported *homo vincens virtutem* *לח* signifies Virtue, Fortitude, one of the great Attributes of God, which Mr. O's Novice did not consider. And God oft in Scripture makes an Attribute to be as it were his proper Name; *1 Sam. 15. 29. The strength of Israel cannot lye*, that is, God cannot. So *Jacob as a Prince had power with Fortitude* it self, that is, with God. And that *Justin* by *Virtue* meant no other than God, may be seen *Dial. p. 285.* where he so reads the place, *ἐν ἀνθρώποις καὶ θεῷ.*

2. It is not then the *LXX.* only us'd in the Synagogues, that *Justin Martyr* challengeth as corrupted by the Jews, but the *Hebrew* also. For after he had defended the Version of the *LXX.* then among the Christians, to have been exactly true in the places before spoken of, and had challeng'd the Jews (*p. 297.*) for having eras'd out of their many intire Passages, which foretold the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ God and Man, which places because the Jews deny'd to belong unto the Scripture, *Justin* promises to make good his general Charge out of those very Scriptures, which the Jews acknowledg'd to be genuine, and accordingly produces a Passage out of *Esdrae*, two out of *Isaiah*, and that of *Psal. 96. 10, ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου*, which Observations he

he had made out of the Scriptures; which the Jews read in their Synagogues. (p. 298.) And he adds, these Corruptions, or at least one had crept in very lately. To all which *Trypho* had not a word to say. It hence appears that *Justin* argues not out of his own single Copies of the *LXX.* which Mr. O. seems to grant had these Passages, but out of many Copies us'd in the Jewish Synagogues, which the Father had carefully examin'd, and in all likelihood *Hebrew* Copies too in Palestine of *Syria*, whereof he was a Native, Nor can we suppose *Justin Martyr* argu'd from his own *Greek* Copy only, but those commonly in the hands of the Christians. He had more sense than so to impose upon himself and *Trypho* too.

3. It must be confessed it is a wonder that even after *Justin* had thus noted these Corruptions, the Christians should not have amended them. But I can produce Mr. O. a like Instance, which must be acknowledg'd parallel. All the *Hebrew* Copies that we have (as far as I can learn) and mine in particular has that of *Psal.* 22. 16. *As a Lion*, instead of *They pierced*; and I have consulted *Pagnine*, who renders it *sanguam Leo*, though in the Margin he has *derunt*. And though all agree that *they pierced* is the true Reading, and though some seem to have found a few Copies in *Hebrew* which have it so, yet for the two Ages last past, wherein Learning has superabounded they have not corrected this *Erratum*. Our beloved Jews doubtless will not suffer us; and we haply are as unwilling as they, lest the Infallibility of the *Hebrew* Text to a tittle, like that of the *Roman* Church, should come to nothing, for this Change would be an open acknowledgment of its Corruption. Let then Mr. Fuller call me *Foulmouth*, and Mr. O. *Blasphemer*, I am still of Opinion, and do aver upon the Authority of *J. M.* that the *Hebrew* Copies the Jewish *LXX.* and both have receiv'd some Corruptions. But to return, If the places had been found in any of the *Hebrew* Copies in the days of *Justin*, it had been an easie matter for *Trypho* and the Jews to have appeal'd to the Original *Hebrew* Verity for their Justification, and retorted upon *J. Martyr*, that

that the Christians rather had been the Authors of the fore-mentioned Interpolations, for the support and advancement of their Religion. They might the more confidently have done this, if *J. M.* had not understood the *Hebrew*.

The Chronological Argument I will not meddle with; I must either Transcribe *Vossius*, or waste more Time and Paper than is needful, since any one may have the intire Argument at the Fountain Head; but to treat of it in short, as Mr. O. has done, and over-look the most, and the best of the Arguments, would be to small purpose. Only remember that *Vossius* establishes the Chronology of the *LXX.* by the Testimony of *Josephus*, between whom there is a very near Agreement: And all the World knows that *Josephus* was a learned Man, a faithful Historian, a Jewish Priest and Interpreter of the Law, and therefore could not be very much mistaken in this matter. But whereas Mr. O. suggests p. 70. that upon this Principle of 6000 Years we cannot prove Christ is yet come, I reply 1. It may upon that very Principle be prov'd, if we will admit (as we ought) the *LXX.* into our assistance. 2. Supposing the *Hebrew* Chronology right, it is not necessary for us to follow the Jewish Principle of 6000 Years; it's sufficient to say, (let what will become of the Chronology whether it be 4. or 6000 Years) that the time of Christ's Appearance in the Flesh was come in the days of *Augustus Cæsar*, when both Jews and Samaritans were big with expectations of him, and thereby acknowledg'd the time to be fulfill'd. Which time, if they believ'd to be 6000 Years it is not unlikely, but they corrupted the *Hebrew* Chronology, to justify their not Believing and Crucifying Him.

The Instance of *Cainan*, *Luke* 3. in Christ's Genealogy, left out of the *Hebrew*, is so clear, that one might justly admire good Authors should so toil and swear, to avoid *Luke's* Testimony; and all for the sake of the *Hebrew* Verity. I can give a plausible Reason, why the Jews might leave

leave *Cainan* out of the *Heb. viz.* Because thereby they would disparage and overthrow *Luke's* Genealogy, and spoil his credit among the Nations. As for other Additions unto the *LXX.* tis nothing to the Point. It is confess'd the *LXX.* has been corrupted : But 'tis—— (I will not say *Blasphemy*) to impute Corruption unto that place, which has receiv'd Testimony from the Spirit of God by the Pen of *Luke.* But says Dr. *Lightsfoot,* *Luke must follow the He-then's Bibles in his Quotations.* That is, *Luke* an Inspir'd Penman (*debet*, as *Jerom* before him) must leave the *Hebrew* Verity, and transcribe out of a corrupt Version of the Scriptures. Some haply would think this not far off *Blasphemy*; but I will not reflect so severely on that worthy and learned Gentleman. 2. The Doctor, adds, *Luke was but a Copyer and not a Corrector* But he was an Inspir'd Copyer, and ought by the *Hebrew* Verity to have amended, at least not have follow'd the Corrupt *LXX.* Ay but, *the Gentiles well acquainted with the LXX would then have call'd Luke's veracity into Question.* A. So they did, if *Jerom* is to be believ'd; however, *Luke* ought not, doubtless did not value this. Let God be true, but every Man a Lyar. Shall an Inspir'd Writer value his own veracity above the Truth of God's Word? The Dr. confesses, *Luke in the rest was a Faithful Transcriber.* Very good, I think so. And why not in this? Or how can a Man believe *him* in any thing, who was unfaithful in one, or two? Here is a curious Principle, upon which *Jerom's* lawfulness of Dissimulation, and the Papists *pia fraudes*, and officious Lies may be vindicated, and differs very little from that Maxim of *Jerom,* *Quid ubique SS. Apostoli & Apostolici viri loquuntur ad populos, is plerumque testimoniis abutuntur, qua jam fuerant in Gentibus divulgata.* The Apostles it seems were very cautious of offending the Gentiles, but not of scandalizing the Jews, and the Jewish Profelytes, by this unfaithful representation of the History of the Jewish Church and Christ's Genealogy.

To the Corruption, noted, *Psalms* 22. 16. Mr. O. replies, and mentions several *Hebrew* Copies, which read, *they pierced*. Very well, and is not this a fair Confession, that the *Hebrew* Copies have in this place generally been corrupted? And I ask, how shall the true Reading be adjusted, but by the Testimony of the *LXX*? For the Passage is not once cited in the New Testament. *It is no wonder* (Mr. O. says) *the Jews should prefer that Reading which favours their Cause*. Right, but 'tis wonder upon wonder to me, the Christian Sticklers for the *Hebrew* Verity, should continue it still in the Text, for fear, (I suppose) of offending the *Jews*, without any regard to the Christians, and to the Truth. Or, rather as Mr. O's Story of the *Famous Dan. Bomb.* for fear of losing the Sale of their Bibles so corrected; for which Reason he might better be styl'd *Infamous*.

I add again that Passage, *Deut.* 32. 8. According to the number of the *Angels*, even *Jerom* himself thus reads it. *Quatuor ventos caeli; quatuor arbitror Angelicas potestates, quibus principalia Regna commissa sunt, juxta illud quod in Deuter, legimus, Quando dividebat altissimus, Gentes, quando separabat filios Adam, constituit Terminos populorum, juxta numerum Angelorum Dei.* It must then be confessed, that this was the true Reading in *Jerom's* time, but not so now. The *Hebrew* Copies therefore at this day are here corrupted, if *Jerom* may be credited.

Com: ad Dan. 7. 2

Once more, take notice, that there is, at this day, a Corruption of the *Hebrew* Text, in the *1 Sam.* 2. 17. Where it plainly discovers it self, the Course of the Story being intolerably perplext and transpos'd, as any one will discern, reading the latter end of the 16th, the whole 17th, and beginning of the 18th Chapter. But I will not enlarge on this, nor trouble you with those lame Solutions of this Difficulty, which I meet with in the *Synopsis*; all of 'em devis'd to salve up the Credit and Infallibility of the *Hebrew* Verity; whereas the most ex-

[18]

pedite and Satisfactory Way, if Men could lay aside
Prejudices, is to correct the place by the LXX.

Moses blessing the several Tribes of Israel, Dent. 33. 6.
Thus speaks of *Ruben* in the *Hebrew*: *Let Ruben live
and not die, and let his men, (his posterity) be few.* For
tho' our Translators have helped the place by adding
the Negative (which indeed ought to be there, else
Moses Curses that Tribe, instead of Blessing it) yet it is
not in the *Hebrew*, as is acknowledg'd by our Tran-
slators, putting the Negative *not*, in a different Character.
Here, again, the Criticks in the *Synopsis* take a
deal of Pains to patch up the *Hebrew* Verity, but with-
out any Satisfaction to me, I do profess.

But let us now take a view of *Jerom*, who will appear
not so tight and so firmly perswaded of the Incorruption
of the *Hebrew* Text, as Mr. O. is, Commenting on that
Passage, *Gal. 3. 13. Cursed is every one that hangeth on
a tree.* He delivers himself thus, *Ex quo mihi videtur,
&c. From whence it seems to me, either that the ancient
Hebrew Copies read the words otherwise, than at present,
or the Apostle expressed the Sense of the Scriptures, not the
Words, or (which is rather to be thought) that the Name
of God was after the Passion of Christ, by some body ad-
ded to the Hebrew, and to our Bibles, that he might dis-
parage us, who believe in Christ (as if) accursed of God.*

Again, on *Micah* 5. 2. He observes that many Ci-
ties or Villages, eleven in number, are reckon'd up,
(*Isa. 15. 60.*) in the LXX, tho' not in the *Hebrew*, and
amongst the rest, *Ephrath*, or *Bethlehem*, which belong'd
to the Tribe of *Judah*, whence Christ sprang, *Matth. 2.
6.* He then adds, *sive de veteribus crasum sit milisio
Judeorum, &c. We know not certainly, whether it was
struck out of the Ancient Copies thro' the Malice of the
Jews, lest Christ should hence appear to have sprang from
the Tribe of Judah, or whether it was added by the LXX.*

But

But enough, and more (I hope) than needed on this Point.

Having, I suppose, made good my Assertion, that the *Hebrew* Bibles have been corrupted in all Ages, I now return to the main Business. When I had been in the Sermon on the Defensive, and had vindicated the Church of *England*, from Mr. D's. frivolous Objections; and having at that time (it was a time of Peace among us) met with a Pamphlet in great Vogue at *Manchester*, Intituled, *Notes on the B. of S. &c.* And another in *M. S.* call'd a Sermon, in both which, we were vilely, Maliciously, and Causelessly traduc'd; and so the Peace being broken, I thought it not improper to carry the War into the Enemies own Country, and to let 'em see, it was possible to give 'em a Diversion, Briefly, I taxt them with that Corruption, *Acts* 6. I argu'd conjecturally, and from Circumstances, but principally from Matter of Fact. And because Mr. O. was not content with one, and that a *Scotch* Instance too; I then prov'd 'em to have countenanc'd and supported the Corruption by two other Overt Acts, which render'd my other Conjectures the more probable, and the main Charge ~~light~~ against them beyond all Controversie. The life of the whole Argument put together, depends on the Evidence of those Matters of Fact, which, whether Mr. O. has vindicated the united Brethren from, is now to be consider'd. But first, take notice, it ought not to surprize you, that my Circumstantial Proofs are made so little account of. Even Malefactors have Brow enough to stand out to the last gasp against such Evidence, and to assert their Innocence, when the Halter is about their Necks, and sometimes against positive Witnesses also.

To the *Cameronian* Instance, all that is offer'd of moment (if that be so) is "Coll. *Fairfax* heard not the "*Gamer*. Urge the corrupt Reading, and that perhaps "the Story pass'd twenty Hands, before it reach'd "the Colonel. But perhaps it pass'd not above one, and it is plain the Colonel believ'd it, and we ought

Alfred

not to think him so Easie and Credulous, as to entertain a Story without good Ground. Besides, in the more large Account, I have of the Story, the Reporter is mention'd by the Collonel, with Honour and Respect, whom he stiles a *Gentleman*, and *perhaps* inclinable to the *Cameronian* Faction, yea, *perhaps* that Gentleman might urge it by way of Dispute with the Collonel. What abundance of things may one surmise? But Mr. O. Pleads, *Person, Time and Place, are not nam'd, that therefore the Evidence is blind, and would look ridiculous in a Court of Judicature.* The proper Answer hereunto, is, that tho' such Testimonies in Courts of Justice, are not accounted sufficient to ground a Judiciary Definitive Sentence upon, yet are they not Ridiculous, but oft-times believ'd by the Court. An Evidence may be sufficient for private Conviction, which will not be allow'd of, in publick Forms of Justice.

St. Paul accuses some of the *Corinthians* (and he had it from some of the House of *Cloe*, whom he mentions not, and through how many Hands it passed, we know not) for disparaging him. *His Letters are weighty and powerful, but his bodily Presence is weak and contemptible.* Here was neither Person, nor Time, nor Place nam'd, and yet Paul believ'd the Report. But the Reason of the Collonel's not naming Person, Time, and Place, is obvious. For not thinking any use would be made of the Story, and neglecting to put down these Circumstances in his Memorials. He easily let 'em slip out of his Memory. The Faith of Men is at a low Ebb, if the want of these Circumstances must damn all Reports as Ridiculous, and especially, when they are but of yesterday.

To the Information of Mr. *Ellison*, he pleads that Mr. *Jolly* is dead, and thereby we are put out of all hopes of being able to examin the Truth. I question not, but you see this is meer shifiting. If Mr. O. doth really suspect the Veracity of Mr. *Ellison*, let him (for he has the

the means) inquire into some of the Circumstances, which will in a good measure clear the rest. There are those in and about *Manchester*, who can tell him there was such a Dissenting Minister as Mr. *Jolly*, that there is such a Place as *Duckenfield hall*, whether Dissenters were wont to resort, and I doubt not, but it may be prov'd, that Mr. *E.* and Mr. *J.* were then engag'd in some Disputes about Church Discipline, and Government. And if so, there is no Reason to reject Mr. *Ellison's* Testimony, as a meer devised Tale. Will any one say this Evidence is a blind one? Would it not be admitted in a Court of Justice? No Judge but upon such Testimonies, would decree the Nuncupative Will of a deceased Person, Good and Valid.

As to that Story from the *Bolton* Gentleman, it is an unexceptionable Proof of what it was produced for. My Business was not to shew, upon what particular Point this falls. Reading was alledg'd either at *Duckenfield*, or in this Dispute, whether about Peoples making, or choosing their own Ministers, but that it has been urg'd in favour of the Popular Government, and the various Reading can concern nothing else. Nor was the Question between Mr. *O.* and me, whether any Dissenting Ministers, but any Protestant Dissenters had ever urg'd the Corrupt Reading, Rem. p. 14. And if these Dissenting Disputants were so ignorant, as they are suspected to be (for they shall be called Ignorant when the Cause requires it, tho' at other times they are the most knowing Persons) can it with Reason be thought, but that the Argument was put into their Mouths by some of their Leaders? Whether Laymen or pretending Ministers, is of no moment in this Case.

Upon the whole Matter; it is, I hope, manifest, that the Dissenters, if they did not contrive the *Erratum*, were justly charg'd with owning it, seeing they have endeavour'd to improve it unto their own Advantage. If they did not beget it, they have at least Father'd it, and why should we refuse 'em the Child, which (right,

or

or wrong, concerns not us) they lay claim unto, and no body else has a mind to, especially when it was in requital for spiteful and groundless Reflections, cast on us by the Note-maker without Provocation: For requital seems to Mr. O. a just Reason for thus doing. Now then, if we must yet dwell upon that Expostulation, who began, and who justly requited? You will find this resolv'd at the entrance of R. R. And yet without any Defence against that part of my Apology, we are still told. *The Note-maker doth not charge any Personal Fault of the Bishop of S. on the whole body of the Episcopal Church*, Vindic. p. 22. But see here how Prejudice and Partiality will blind a Man; for he immediately subjoyns, that the Note-maker retorts the Schism upon the Church, which the Bishop of S. had suppos'd the Dissenters guilty of. Now I think the Episcopal Church is here charg'd with ~~the Schism~~ supposed Fault, that is, taxing the Dissenters with Schism. He should have let us (at least of Manchester) alone; for there the Storm was to fall, whatever the Title Page says it was in *usum Sarum*. Nor should he have left his Subject, and Reproach'd us with Atheism, Socinianism, Perjury, &c. What's this to Schism? Or was it for the Service of the Government, to discourage Men from Submitting to it? I observe this, because these Men are so apt (like our Dragoons last among us) to accuse every body of Jacobitism, that stands in their way, when as none more effectually promote it than they. And if some shall be esteem'd Perjur'd for the Alteration of their former Principles, what shall we think of a multitude of Dissenters, who, if they did not swear ~~firmly~~ unto K. 7. yet solemnly promis'd it? Read Father *Allop's* Speech to the late King, in the Name, and at the Head of a Body his Brethren, and you will be forc'd to say, they are, if not false Swearers, yet egregious Lyars, departing from their publick and declar'd Protestations, which I think comes pretty near the Fault, others are (I think unjustly) accus'd of. But I dismiss the *Note-maker*.

4 Bp's

frally

of

There

There remains now the Case of Mr. B. and Mr. P. The former's Greatness was alledg'd as sufficient excuse, why he vouchsaf'd to make no Answer to his Accuser; but the *Goliath* look'd scornfully on little *David*, and made no reckoning of him. He had leisure to uncover the nakedness of the *Fathers*, but none to hide his own; to revile them, but to commend himself. And for his greater Honour to interweave the whole History of the Times and publick Transactions with his own, which (as I take it) was too assuming and arrogant. Thus his Life swell'd into a prodigious and intolerable length. 'Tis observable that whoever ador'd him and embrac'd his Sentiments, with what Laurels he was wont to adorn their Temples as well as his own; but if any Man dar'd to gainsay him, or refus'd to truckle unto his Dictates, they were sure to be Thunder-struck by this *J. O. M.* For which Reason the Ancient Fathers Infirmities were so imprudently expos'd to the dishonour of Christianity. Though we owe our Religion under God to their Zeal and Learning. For these and the like Reasons, it was, that some Men of his own Fraternity have rewarded him, as he had serv'd others. Doubtless you have seen that Pamphlet, &c.

From the whole you will learn (as also by Mr. O's. and the Note-makers Writings) what liberty these patient, peaceable, mortify'd, and sanctify'd Men: These are the usual Characters they give one another) take in spitefully reviling their Adversaries, though in the main of their own Perswasion, No wonder then if they treat us as barbarously. And if you want another example of this, I send you to *the Confutation of Mr. Williams, by Mr. Alsop*, and to the *History of the Union*, where no quarter is given to these Gentlemen, who (especially Father *Alsop*) are (as we speak) *hand'd without Mittens*. But if a Church of *England* Man meddles with any of 'em they seem to be of the Humour of that lewd Souldier, who excus'd himself thus, that the Commandment is *thou shalt not*, but not, *I shall not* ——— The Author of the said Pamph-

Pamphlet may venture to deliver many sad Truths of Mr. B. but the Rector must not. The sum is, and my design was to note, that Mr. B's. Greatness ought not to be his Protection; nor did he truly deserve that Epithet. A Man ought not to be commended at adventures. All that can be said of him with respect to Greatness, is, that He was a person of very good naturall Parts, but of no Improvements proportionable to them. Thus much I have to say on my own behalf for speaking and writing as I did, when just Ocasion was offered me.

The same Motive drew in Mr. P. he was a Passable Man, and that's all that can be said of him truly: but to make an Hero of him, and to tell the World he shi'd among us, *tanquam inter Stellas Luna minores*, to carry his Character higher than it really deserv'd, and for want of Materials to guess at some excellencies, which he was so far from meriting, that the contrary must needs be allow'd against him, is an Artifice of advancing the credit of a Party, which ought not to be endur'd, and none but designing Men will engage themselves in. What I took notice of, was his Marrying without the Womans Parents consent, and producing a *Diploma* or Testimonial of taking his Degree at Cambridge.

Hear then my Evidence. A Gentleman of my Parish who knew him well, acquainted me with both above Twenty years ago, and oft-times since, occasionally in Discourse. When therefore I read his Life, I went immediately to the Register of the Class, where I found, "That
 " Mr. L. was accus'd, Aug. 15. 1650. for having con-
 " summated a Marriage between Mr. P. and one S.S.
 " Clandestinely and Irregularly, therefore the said Mr. P.
 " and Mr. L. are appointed to appear again at the next
 " Meeting. Septemb. 12. *disso*, Mr. P. is appointed to
 " bring in a Certificate under the hand of his own, and
 " his Wives Parents, testifying their consent to the Mar-
 " riage, that the Class (at the same time) hath receiv'd
 " satisfaction, and acquiesceth in the acknowledgment
 " of

" of Mr. P. and Mr. L. concerning their irregular Proceedings in the late Clandestine Marriage of Mr. P. " Then *November 14. ditto* Mr. P. brought in his Certificate concerning Parent consent to the Marriage. No Man alive laying these things together, but would have concluded the Marriage was made without the Consent of S. S's Parents, especially when the other Report prov'd true beyond all Controversie. As for Mts. P. and R. M's Testimony to the contrary, there is still one defect in them; we are not told that Mr. P's ^{parents} consented to the Marriage before its consummation, and this is the more to be suspected, because the Marriage was consummated *Clandestinely* and *Irregularly*, under an Hedge in an Ale-house, or without Banns asked, I know not which, but I am sure not by an Ordain'd Minister, contrary to the Law of the Land. But why all this, if their Parents had consented before-hand? Besides, it was Two Months or ever Mr. P. produc'd a Certificate of Parents consent, which makes it probable *his* Parents consented not before the Marriage, but were drawn to it with difficulty, when there was no other remedy. Finally Mr. P. acknowledg'd himself guilty of some Irregularity or other, which is sufficient to the general Design of my Argument. However in the next place that Mr. P. took no Degree in the U. of C. proves true you see beyond any Contradiction or Apology offer'd to the contrary. And if my Relator was in the right in one Story, why should I question the other? I avoid here speaking openly or further aggravating Mr. P's fault; for I will not dwell upon so foul a Miscarriage, though one might take the advantage here to expose both the guilty Party and his Vindicator too. But I have utterly resolv'd against it, and so dismiss the Matter of Fact as now taken *pro confesso*.

Here then you have an Instance of Mr. O's dealing with Arguments by halves, which fault he falls into almost in every Page, and in some Pages more than once; But we must bear with him in this, his Design being (as

to me seems) only to Write a Satyr and deride the Reader, let the Points in Question shift for themselves as they can. Much good may it do him. I am at his Service, and when he has revild me as much as he's able, I am perswaded he'll never make the World believe; I am either Fool, or Knave, or Impudent; or a *Blasphemer*, the Dissenters themselves (that know me) being Judges: For to them I am content to surrender the Interests of my Reputation. I will only speak of one Passage in the *Vindication* and so conclude. He acquaints his Reader p. 32. that *I give him the Character of a great Rogue*. Really, if I did so, I were no manner of way to be excused. What I said in *R. R.* p. 58. Was, *That the Dissenters have themselves own'd, that if Mr. O. is indeed guilty of the Crime laid against him, he is a great Rogue*, and in the Margin I declared the Expression to be none of mine. Now, Sir, I am content to be the Rogue my self, if I am guilty of calling him so. But if without any colour he has in this thing charged me falsely, and robb'd me of my Reputation, among all those that shall read his *Vindication*, and not consult my *R. R.* which I am perswaded one Reader of 100 will not do, then I leave it to any Man's Judgment, whether he has not done what in him lies to deserve that Character which I never did, nor will give him.

The Corrupting St.
Chr.

Finally, I take leave to tell you, (I do it with some Confidence) that there is scarce one Paragraph (and they are numerous) but I could easily detect in it some material Defect or other; and effectually answer it; but to what purpose? When shall we have an end? It would have been hard to undertake so particular a Reply, without falling into hard words, which is the thing I have carefully declin'd. I am not sensible

ble that I have given him any ill Language, or
Cause of Exasperation, except haply it be in this
one thing, that I refuse to scold with him.

I hope both he and you will forgive me this wrong.

And remain yours,

T. G.

April 8. 1699.

FINIS.
